DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 480 AC 003 973

By-Stotts, Michael J.

Field Study of the Perceptions of Directors' Leader Behavior in Illinois Basic Education Centers.

Illinois State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Springfield. Dept. of Adult Education.
Pub Date Aug 68
Note-57p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.95
Descriptors-Administrator Qualifications, Administrator Role, *Adult Basic Education, *Chief Administrators, Evaluation, Field Studies, *Leadership Styles, *Perception, Research, Self Evaluation, Study Centers, Teacher Experience, *Teachers
Identifiers-Illinois, *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

This statewide study involving 11 adult basic education centers in Illinois sought new information on the behavior of full time directors of adult basic education. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was administered to all teachers and administrators in the centers in response to these questions: "How does the director behave," and "How should the director behave." Twelve dimensions of leader behavior were measured. Tests of significance were computed for variance within and between groups. On all but three variables, teachers and directors basically agreed on how a director does behave. On directors' self descriptions, mean scores showed ideal leader behavior to be scaled higher than real leader behavior. Significant differences appeared on eight variables when variance was analyzed using the self descriptions. Teacher expectations of directors' leader behavior tested for significance on ten variables. Teachers' standards, then, for leader behavior were consistently higher than teachers' perceptions of the directors' actual leader behavior. (The LBDQ, an interviewer guide, an information sheet, seven tables, and nine references are included.) (author.ly)

ED027480

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FIELD STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF DIRECTORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR IN ILLINOIS BASIC EDUCATION CENTERS

BY
MICHAEL J. STOTTS
OAK PARK, ILLINOIS

AUGUST, 1968

AC 003 973

ISSUED BY
DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
RAY PAGE, SUPERINTENDENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

During the conduct of this field study, and subsequently during the period when information was tabulated and the study was written in its final form, many persons contributed special efforts. The author is indebted to four members of the Northern Illinois University faculty for assistance. Dr. Winston L. Roesch gave generously of his advice and editorial comment. Dr. Philip C. Wells and Dr. Ralph A. Belnap provided additional advisement and inspiration. Dr. Peter Abrams guided the construction of the design and it was he who was able to direct the statistical tabulations and computations through the Computer Center at Northern Illinois University.

Special recognition is extended to three adult educators for their combined support of a project that could not have been completed without their help: Dr. Roger W. Axford, Director of Adult Education, University of Maine; Mr. Thomas W. Mann, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Continuing Education; and Mr. Keith R. Lape, Assistant Director. Mr. Mann and Mr. Lape serve the educational needs of adults in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, Illinois. Mr. Lape saved the author many miles of travel by conducting the interviews in downstate Illinois.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. James C. Yokum and Dr. Ralph M. Stogdill, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, for their cooperation in granting permission to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in this study.

Without the nearly one hundred per cent cooperation of the directors, teachers, and supervisors of Illinois adult basic education centers, the study could not have been accomplished; without their dedication this state could not boast of the service they render toward the improvement of literacy and employability skills in the Illinois adult.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM 1

The Problem 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Need for the Study 2

Limitations of the Study 8

Hypotheses 8

Definitions 8

II. DESIGN OF THE STUDY 11

Scope of the Study 11

Centers 11

The Instrument 13

Collection of the Data 15

The Interview 15

Procedure 16

Scoring and Coding 18

Treatment of the Data 19

Analysis Methodology 19

III. FINDINGS 21

Real Leader Behavior of Directors 21

Real and Ideal Leader Behavior: Self-Descriptions 26

Real and Ideal Leader Behavior: Teachers' Descriptions 29

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....33

Summary.....33

Conclusions 34

Recommendations 35

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX A. Adult Basic Education Centers Participating in the Study 39

APPENDIX B. Sample Items From The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, From XII 40

APPENDIX C. Interviewer Guide 42

APPENDIX D. Introduction Letter to Directors (sample).....43

APPENDIX E. Information Sheet.....45

APPENDIX F. Coding Sheet 46

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Means, Standard Deviations and t Ratios of Mean Differences in Real Leader Behavior: Directors' Self-Descriptions and Teachers' Descriptions.....22

II. Means, Standard Deviations, and t Ratios of Mean Differences in Real and Ideal Behavior of Directors' Self-Descriptions 28

III. Means, Standard Deviations, and t Ratios of Mean Differences in Real and Ideal Leader Behavior of Directors: Teachers' Descriptions.....31

IV. Experience Qualifications of 128 Teachers in Basic Education Centers of Illinois.....47

V. Background Characteristics of 128 Teachers in Basic Education Centers of Illinois.....48

VI. Experience Qualifications of (11) Eleven Directors of Basic Education Centers in Illinois.....49

VII. Background Characteristics of (11) Eleven Directors of Basic Education Centers in Illinois.....50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

I. The Problem

Statement of the Problem. The purpose of this study was to provide new information on the leader behavior of directors of adult basic education in Illinois. The study provided data on the director's own perceptions of his leader behavior and on the teachers' perceptions of the director's leader behavior. An attempt was made to show relationships between "what is" the leader behavior of directors and "what should be" their leader behavior as perceived by the directors and by their teaching staffs.

The research sought to answer the following specific questions. To what extent are directors, as a group, in agreement as they perceive themselves performing leadership acts? To what extent are teachers, as a group, in agreement in their perceptions of the directors' performance as a leader? And finally, to what extent are directors in agreement in their perceptions of "what should be" their performance as leaders? Similarly, to what extent are teachers in agreement on "what should be" the performance of their directors as leaders?

The basic instrument for collecting data on twelve dimensions of leader behavior was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, sometimes referred to by the acronym, LBDQ. Twelve variables were identified by the instrument; the variables were identified as they correspond to commonly held descriptions of behavior of leaders in diverse fields of leadership.

Because of the importance assigned to the director's role in overseeing the adult basic education program and in exercise of the leader's function in the adult basic education center, the purpose of this study served to identify the twelve dimensions as they are perceived to be in evidence in Illinois basic education centers. Particularly important is the emphasis given to each of the dimensions by the directors of the centers.

Need for the study. Adult basic education administration is a new development within the framework of adult education administration. It should also be defined as a part of a larger whole within the field of educational administration. The methods employed and the concepts which guide the direction of adult basic education programs assume the same degree of importance as those that exist for the administrator of elementary and secondary school programs. But differences in curriculum and teaching methodology and age of the students are apparent. These situational factors are important and may demand a unique orientation and a special dedication.

In the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966" the Congress placed special emphasis on adult basic education, first, by restrictively defining adult education as including only those instructional services below the college level and, secondly, by including in the text of the legislation a liberal recognition of the adult basic education programs. This legislation focused on the individual in our society who has not thus far received a twelfth-grade education.[1] Adult education in this act was conceived as properly including

---

[1] Basic Education focuses particularly on a reading, language, and arithmetic curriculum similar to that offered in grades 1-5 of the elementary school program. The objectives of this program are spelled out below in the definition of Adult Basic Education.

the high school drop-out; the objectives of adult basic education became conterminous with the basic goal of elementary education in this country-to provide students with the ability to read, speak, and write effectively. Significantly, provision was also included for upgrading the skills and abilities of teachers and administrators of basic education.

One of the most far-reaching developments of Section 309 of this act is the broad interpretation of the teacher-trainer clause:

> The sums reserved in section 304 (a) for the purpose of this section shall be used for making special grants or providing teacher-training grants in accordance with this section.[2]

The forward action of a federal program designed to implement Section 309 was illustrated in the degree of emphasis given to training of both teachers and administrators in the summer of 1967. Nineteen workshops of at least two weeks duration were held in regional areas of the United States during this period. Nine of the workshops offered advanced training in administrative technique for directors of basic education. This would seem to be the largest single undertaking in leadership training of basic education administrators to that date.

While a complete evaluation of these workshops has yet to be published, it is significant that over four hundred administrators from all but a few of the states were able to participate in practicums of approximately eighty instructional hours each. This single effort of the federal government was eloquent testimony to the propriety of selecting the administrator for leadership training

---

[2] United States Congress, Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, 89th Congress, on H. R. 13161, November 3, 1966 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 30.

in basic education.

The legislature of the State of Illinois reacted to the immediacy of factors requiring stronger legislation in adult education during the same period. In August, 1967, legislation, primarily of an enabling character, gave increased impetus to adult education activities in Illinois. The Adult Education Act of 1967 encouraged the establishment of adult programs of education of significantly greater depth and scope than had been heretofore authorized in the School Code of Illinois.[3]

Illinois, and particularly Cook County, already has extensive programs in basic education. Little evidence exists, however, that the state's institutions of higher learning or the local public school district has seriously accepted a responsibility for the education of illiterate and occupationally handicapped adults. Least of all is there acceptance of the need to train the leaders of these types of programs. There are exceptions. The University of Chicago offers a graduate program in adult education for aspiring students; the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Illinois Department of Public Aid both recognize the value of a concentrated attack on the problems besetting the illiterate, impoverished adult. The present Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ray Page, commented three years ago on the need for basic education:

> In Illinois today we have advanced at a bold pace to provide Basic Education for this handicapped group-the uneducated and the undereducated. Our state-Illinois-is the first state in the nation to require Basic Adult Education and/or vocational training for those least able and in greatest need-the public aid recipient... These classes are operated under the provisions...which

---

[3] General Assembly of the State of Illinois, The Adult Education Act, 75th General Assembly, Senate Bill 1416, August 14, 1967.

> authorizes the Public Aid Commission to enter into agreements with my office, for the purchase of such instruction from cooperating school districts.[4]

Because of an ill-defined image of the duties and responsibilities of the adult basic education director and because of the relative newness of the position itself, research evidence has provided little insight into the area of basic education administration. Often, basic education administration is considered a sub-function of adult education administration; therefore, it is assumed that the director of adult education in a community has sufficient background for judging the relative merits of basic education and the criteria for its administration. Likewise, an elementary principal is adjudged most knowledgeable in the basic skills taught to primary-age children; therefore a reapplication of his knowledge is adequate to the task of directing a program where basic skills are taught to adults. This reasoning may be correct. Our selection processes are resourceful, practical, expedient; no scientific evidence exists to dispute this course of action. Nonetheless, specialized leadership training in adult basic education remains minimal or nonexistent.

It would seem at first glance, there is no argument for the adoption of new measures for the improvement in the preparation of basic education leaders. Yet, there is the suggestion that we examine currently employed procedures used in the selection of the administrator, that we evaluate the number and kinds of opportunities available to interested students of basic education administration, and that we investigate the state of our knowledge about leadership criteria in basic education. Accepting the need to further our

---

[4] Frank H. Schnert, "A New Effort in Adult Education in Southern Illinois," Adult Leadership, 10:314, April, 1964.

knowledge in these areas, the present situation leads to the following questions: Will adult basic education administration remain a lame duck area in the larger context of educational administration? Is there a sufficient body of knowledge available now on which to judge the effectiveness of leadership of basic education programs? Is the behavior of the director more or less important in its relation to administration of basic education? If specific leadership training of basic education administrators were instituted, on what basis should a curriculum be constructed? The conditional answers to these questions give impetus to a need for new research in leadership of basic education.

If the profession wants the best possible training for leadership in basic education then thoughtful analysis must be given to the precedents which have been established in leadership training. Griffith echoes this concern with this statement:

> The question now is not, "Should the public schools conduct adult education programs?" for that question is being answered in Washington and in state capitals all over the United States. Instead, the question now is, "Will the schools be equal to the calls for leadership, and will they provide appropriately trained and administratively supported directors for their adult programs?" No longer are the calls for leadership muted and muffled. They sound forth with clarity and impatience. It is the responsibility of the administrator to set the direction and to develop the staff to enable the school district to conduct educational programs for adults of a quality which may appropriately be expected of educational leaders.[5]

Of the paucity of research in adult education administration, there can be no doubt. In a publication that reviews the research in adult education,

---

[5] William S. Griffith, "Public School Adult Education, A Growing Challenge," Administrators' Notebook, 13:4, March, 1965.

Kreitlow is generous in his statement about patterns of educational leadership:

> No generally superior pattern of educational leadership has been identified, but research on leadership has been increasing. Information about leadership is relevant to changing adult behavior. Some basic research is beginning to contribute to this area of knowledge.[6]

The general lack of information about adult basic education is nowhere more in evidence than by its absence from the reviews of educational research. The subject of adult basic education leadership, especially, has been largely unexplored. The result is that research in allied fields continues to be the launching-pad for decisions affecting basic education programs. This includes the adoption of leadership criteria. Though it is not the task of this research to review the literature, there appears to be a growing concern in general education with leadership, organizational behavior, and executive performance. The rationals for this interest assumes a connection between leader behavior and teacher performance, attainment of operational objectives, and establishment of suitable learning climates.

In short, the intelligent application of current and past research in allied fields is only a partial answer to the growing pains of adult basic education administration. In the meantime, one approach to a clarification of the issues in basic education would appear to be the accumulation of meaningful data. It is the aim of this study to contribute empirical evidence to an understanding of the leadership role and to provide data for subsequent research in basic education leadership.

---

[6] Burton W. Kreitlow, Educating the Adult Educator, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, March, 1965), p. 21.

Limitations of the study. The fundamental limitation of this study was established automatically by the instrument used to gather data. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was a paper-and-pencil test that could be used effectively in lieu of direct observation of the subjects in this study.

The size of the sample was a second limitation. Eleven adult basic education centers participated in the study. Therefore, eleven directors became the focal point of the research. The findings, then, were restricted to the eleven centers.

This study should not be assumed to offer recommendation for change in the leader behavior of the directors involved in the study. Nor can the evidence be taken as evaluative of leaders, leadership, or program effectiveness within the participating adult basic education centers.

Hypotheses. Within the sample the study attempted to test the following hypotheses:

1. No significant differences exist in the opinions of directors and teachers about how a director behaves.

2. No significant differences exist in the opinions of directors about how a director behaves and how he should behave.

3. No significant differences exist in the opinions of teachers about how a director behaves and how he should behave.

II. Definitions

Definition of terms. The definitions used in this study correspond in some cases to definitions contained in state and federal legislation; in other instances the derivations have been determined expirically by the investigator.

Adult basic education. As used in this study "adult basic education" is identical to the term as defined in Public Law 89-750.

> The term "adult basic education" means education for adults whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability, which is designed to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, to improve their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and to making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.[7]

Adult and continuing education. This term, as used in this study, is defined as it appears in the Illinois Adult Education Act of 1967:

> "Adult and Continuing Education": Organized, systematic instruction, and related educational services, for students enrolled in a program conducted by a publicly supported institution. Such students are beyond compulsory education age, not currently enrolled in a regular elementary or high school, and are not seeking junior college credit toward an associate degree or degree. The instruction may be full-time or part-time for the purpose of providing students or groups with opportunities for personal enrichment and improvement, preparation for effective participation as citizens (including English for foreign-speaking individuals), family life and parent education, elementary and high school education, for which credit may be granted toward diploma requirements, occupational and technical training and retraining.[8]

Adult basic education center. The term "adult basic education center" means a school, established for the purpose of offering a beginning program of education for adults who are located within a reasonably close distance

---

[7] United States Congress, Amendments, op. cit., Section 303 (c), p. 27.

[8] General Assembly of Illinois, The Adult Education Act of 1967, Section 1-3(a), op. cit.

of where instruction will take place. The curriculum to be offered is defined above as adult basic education. In this study, the center is staffed by a full-time director and faculty whose services include a full-time commitment to the objectives of their program. The center normally operates during the daylight hours.

Director. As used in this study, the term "director" means the immediate supervisor of a composite work-group in adult basic education centers in Illinois. He is the person who leads the teaching corps in curriculum, personnel administration, reporting, supervision of student services, and all other matters relating to the task of administering to the needs of students and teachers of his center. He is the first-line administrator whose responsibility includes overall operation of the instructional program in the center.

Adult basic education teacher. This term refers to the person who is directly involved in the learning process with specific groups of students. Educational background, training, and experience in a particular subject area or areas have prepared him to transmit special occupational or academic skills to the learner. In this study, he holds a full-time position in the center.

Leader behavior. The term "leader behavior" encompasses all of the external appearances and actions, executive in character and perceived as acts of the immediate supervisor of a specific work-group. The definition, in this study, is restricted to the involvement of the director of an adult basic education center in support of the basic education program.

CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

It is the director, the most visible administrator in his work-group, who exhibits that leader behavior which is held in this study to be a key to the success of the total basic education program. The present study does not answer the questions that arise about quality of program or effectiveness of leadership. The design sets forth methods and means for dealing with perceptions of the director's leader behavior with a view to developing greater understanding of his role in certain areas of leadership.

I. Scope of the Study

Centers. Adult basic education in Illinois is conducted through the local public school system with the exception of one center in this study which is administered as a part of a junior college program. A list of the participating centers appears as Appendix A of this study.

In a cooperative agreement with the Department of Public Aid, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction conducts programs under Section 10-22.20 of the School Code of Illinois. Additional funds are received by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction under the provisions of the Adult Education Act of 1966, Public Law 89-750. The Department of Adult Education, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, reimburses each of the locally administered centers 100% of the operating cost of their adult basic education program.

In cooperation with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, fourteen full-time centers were located.

Criteria for selection of the centers included the following five factors:

1. The center should be established for the sole purpose of offering an adult basic education curriculum as defined in this study.

2. The center should have at least five full-time teachers of adult basic education.

3. The instructional leader of the center should be a full-time director.

4. The center should be supported by local tax monies.

5. The center should be located within the state boundaries of Illinois.

All of the centers which met the above criteria, with the exception of one center, participated in the study. A variety of circumstances combined to preclude the one non-participating center from inclusion. The director did complete the instrument used with all other respondents, but this data was not included in the analysis.

Two other centers, originally thought to meet the criteria, were excluded from consideration when both centers failed to meet Criteria Two.

Within each center only the teaching faculty and the director were included as participants. A determination was made that this research would recognize the teaching faculty as that part of the work-group most able to make the necessary inferences about the directors' behavior. The uniform nature and scope of teacher contacts with their supervisors and the instructional relationship held between the teacher and the instructional leader were judged to conform most consistently with the goals of the basic education program. For this reason, superordinates and subordinates who serve to promote the

instructional goals of the center, but who do not serve in the relationship of teachers vis-a-vis the director, were not considered for inclusion in the study.

The instrument. A single standardized instrument was chosen to measure perceptions of leader behavior in each of the adult basic education centers. The following brief description of the instrument was taken from the Manual of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Form XII:

> The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, often referred to as the LBDQ, was developed for use in obtaining descriptions of a supervisor by the group members whom he supervises. It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group.[9]

Twelve dimensions of leader behavior are described by the measuring instrument. These dimensions correspond to patterns of behavior much in the manner of other adult patterns, except for the fact that specific patterns of leader behavior are described by this instrument. The following definitions have been determined by their author to coincide with patterns of behavior observed to be present in the day-to-day administration of adult basic education centers. The determination has been that while behavior patterns are daily exhibited to a greater or lesser degree, these leader behavior dimensions are identified as part of a behavior continuum, unique in their orientation to persons who have been designated as leaders:

---

[9] Ralph M. Stodgill, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form III, (Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1963), p. 1.

1. Representation - speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)

2. Demand reconciliation - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces order to system. (5 items)

3. Tolerance of uncertainty - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)

4. Initiation of structure - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)

5. Persuasiveness - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)

6. Tolerance of freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. (10 items)

7. Role assumption - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)

8. Consideration - regards the confort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)

9. Production Emphasis - applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)

10. Predictive accuracy - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately. (5 items)

11. Integration - maintains a closely knit organization; receives inter-member conflicts. (5 items)

12. Superior orientation - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)[10]

Leader behavior is reflected in the instrument on each of one hundred Likert-type items. Participants are asked in the group interviews to respond to the specific kinds of behaviors described in each item. Respondents indicate whether their director always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never acts as described. Appendix B contains a sample of items from the instrument used in the study.

---

[10] Ralph M. Stodgill, Manual, op. cit., p. 3.

II. Collection of the Data

The interview. Three factors combined to require that thoughtful consideration be given to the methods used in the collection of the data: (1) the comparatively small size of the sample, (2) the relative significance of attaining as close to one hundred percent of the population selected for investigation as was possible, and (3) the uncertainties of response and the consequent validity considerations that often accompany the use of mailed questionnaires. It was decided that 'group interviews' would assure a higher degree of participation, especially when the interviewer could offer a brief but thorough explanation of the research topic and the research analysis technique. The resulting interest and cooperation of the directors themselves proved this assumption to be correct, with the following exceptions: one teacher excused herself after attending the orientation; one center did not participate, though three visits were made to this center in the hope that they could be persuaded to support the research.

One of two interviewers[11] personally visited each of the adult basic education centers through pre-arranged appointments with the directors. Both interviewers had had previous experience with basic education personnel. Each had considerable background in educational administration and each had been prepared in the interview technique. As a further precaution toward excluding bias, each interviewer used an "Interview Guide and Cover Sheet" to ensure consistency of approach and uniformity of procedure throughout the testing procedure. Appendix C contains a copy of these instructions.

---

[11] Mr. Keith R. Lape, Assistant Director, Department of Adult Education, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, served as a second interviewer in the centers in southern Illinois.

Additional ensurance toward the attainment of the highest possible degree of participation and response to separate items on the questionnaire accrued as a result of the group interview technique. Respondents were cautioned to recheck their completed instruments before submitting them to the interviewer; the interviewer then scanned the completed instrument before accepting it; omissions, except in a few instances, were thus avoided. Unusable questionnaires were therefore kept to a bare minimum.

Of a total number of 280 questionnaires completed, 10 or 3.7 per cent were discarded as unusable. The minimum number of participants from any one center, excluding directors, was seven; the maximum number of participants from any one center was thirteen.

Procedure. Initial contact was made by letter from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to each director of an adult basic education center who appeared to meet the criteria of the study. A second letter from the interviewer who would come to the center followed the first. As noted in a sample of the second letter (see Appendix D) a telephone conversation was suggested as a next step. In the telephone conversation allowance was made for a discussion of unanswered questions and a commitment to participate was made by the director. From this point on, the conduct of the field study proceeded systematically.

The meetings with the faculties and directors were held in the adult basic education centers during the last three months of 1967. Faculty meeting rooms or classrooms provided the setting for each testing session. Before meeting the faculty, a brief meeting was held with the director and his superior, if available.

This meeting allowed for further discussion of the research and the details of administration. The meeting with the faculty then took place.

It should be mentioned that faculties sometimes arrived early or remained late for the research purpose. On one occasion the research was designated as an in-service program; in nearly all centers interest by the participants was at a high level.

In the orientation to the study, participants were given the reasons for the research and its anticipated value. Confidentiality of individual response was assured. Since the data to be gathered were intended to be of collective use, evaluation of the director or the basic education program in the center was disavered as the purpose of the study. Every opportunity was taken to explain to faculties and directors the procedure to be used in the analysis of data.

Four separate operations comprised presentation and administration of the instrument in the testing sessions: (1) orientation, (2) completion of face-sheet information, (See Appendix E), (3) completion of the questionnaire as indicated in the printed instructions to participants, and (4) completion of a second questionnaire with altered verbal instructions from the interviewer.

Halpin[12] in an earlier study had used the LBDQ with Ohio school superintendents. He conceived of the dual use of the instrument with a single sample. By administering the instrument a second time, as in (4) above, he instructed the participants in his study to complete the questionnaire in

[12] Andrew W. Malpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959), p. 31.

response to the following altered direction, "how should the superintendent behave?" The same procedure in the present study was followed; instead of the word 'superintendent', the word 'director' was substituted. Only in rare instances was further explanation warranted.

Cooperation by directors and faculties during the testing sessions was marked by an enthusiasm and sincerity of purpose. The sophistication of several faculty members in research procedures and the research topic itself, led to mild speculation on the results of the statistical analysis. The spirited discussions provided additional inspiration to the interviewers in the conduct of the field study.

Scoring and Coding. Coding of the questionnaires avoided identification of individuals, except for directors who could be identified as occupying a distinct position in the center. Through the use of coded numbers the position of the respondent, the name of the center, and the 'real' or 'ideal' descriptions were organized and tabulated in preparation for data-processing of the questionnaire results.

Individually completed questionnaires were hand-scored by the principal investigator. Face-sheet information was tabulated in a similar fashion. Tables IV through VII in the Appendix show the background and qualifications of participants in the study.

Each item on the questionnaire was scored separately. The raw score was then transferred to a separate scoring sheet (See Appendix F). Totals on each dimension of leader behavior were obtained by summing the separate item scores;

the result of this procedure produced twelve scores on each behavior dimension.

Totals of the item scores on each of twelve dimensions of leader behavior provided twelve raw scores for each respondent on the 'real' descriptions. Similarly, there were twelve scores on each of twelve dimensions of leader behavior for each respondent on the 'ideal' descriptions. Identification codes were also transferred to the scoring sheet. The simplified data was ready for re-transferrence to IBM punched cards.

III. Treatment of the Data

Analysis methodology. Upon completion of the transferrence of raw data to IBM punched cards, information was independently verified from 270 separate scoring sheets. The punched card information was given to the Computer Center at Northern Illinois University for further processing.

Programming instructions to the computer included the calculation of critical ratios (t values) on each of the twelve dimensions of leader behavior. Each dimension of leader behavior was treated as a separate variable. Significant differences between means on each variable were computed and compared on two groups of respondents-directors and teachers. These calculations tested for significance of difference on the 'real' descriptions of leader behavior; identical tests computed differences on the 'ideal' descriptions.

Calculations were again made on the 'ideal' descriptions independently of the 'real' descriptions, and again using an identical procedure with the two groups of respondents. The third calculation involved determination of significance of difference within the teacher groups' 'real' and 'ideal' descriptions.

Differences in the computations were reported significant at the .05 and the .01 levels of confidence.

Calculations included separate mean scores on each of twelve variables as well as the standard deviations. The results of these computations are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

The presentation of the findings in this study has been organized into three sections, each section constituting a separate discussion of the three hypotheses. Tabled data are also included in this chapter as a necessary adjunct to the discussion. For reasons that contribute to simplified reading and reference, the data have been combined into three tables, each of which contains the data applicable to the hypotheses under discussion.

Additional tabled data in the Appendix present comparative data about the teachers and directors who participated in the study. Because the eleven basic education centers in the study constitute the major thrust in public school sponsored basic education, the value of this information should be assessed as representative of the experience and background of all full-time teachers and directors who serve in this field of the education profession in Illinois.

I. Real Leader Behavior of Directors

Table I reports the statistical information on the teachers' descriptions and the directors' self-descriptions about 'real' leader behavior. In this table, all of the teachers' mean scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the eleven directors' mean scores were representative of each of the two groups of respondents. The interrelationship of these two groups of scores on each of twelve variables was reported in a measure of variance-the t ratio. The formula used[13] for computation of the standard error assumed

---

[13] Allen L. Edwards, Statistical Method For The Behavioral Sciences. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1963), pp. 253-254.

TABLE I

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t RATIOS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN REAL LEADER BEHAVIOR: DIRECTORS' SELF-DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCRIPTIONS BY THEIR TEACHERS

	Descriptions of Real Leader Behavior by Teachers			Self-Descriptions of Real Leader Behavior by Directors			
Variable	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t
Representation	21.45	2.526	124	20.09	3.477	11	1.53
Demand Reconciliation	20.79	3.252	124	18.36	2.541	11	2.43
Tolerance of Uncertainty	39.26	5.655	124	34.00	6.557	11	2.89
Initiation of Structure	39.90	6.005	124	36.55	5.466	11	1.77
Persuasiveness	40.38	5.049	124	38.27	5.764	11	1.30
Tolerance of Freedom	42.81	5.739	124	43.73	2.573	11	.523
Role Assumption	41.01	5.908	124	36.64	5.714	11	2.34
Consideration	41.95	5.682	124	40.91	2.663	11	.591
Production Emphasis	31.71	5.401	124	30.45	4.612	11	.746
Predictive Accuracy	19.02	2.892	124	18.45	2.796	11	.631
Integration	20.86	3.716	124	20.09	2.256	11	.770
Superior Orientation	39.96	4.476	124	39.36	3.501	11	.429

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence t (133) = 1.98
**Significant at the .01 level of confidence t (133) = 2.63

independent groups of subjects in all statistical procedures. The t values were obtained in an algerbraic derivation of the standard error formula:

$$SE_{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2} = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 s_1^2 + n_2 z_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}$$

On all but three variables, teachers and directors were essentially in agreement about how a director does behave. The hypotheses that states: No significant differences exist in the opinions of directors and teachers about how a director behaves was accepted on nine of the twelve variables. The null hypotheses was rejected on two variables at the .05 level of confidence. The two variables were demand reconciliation and role assumption. On the variable, tolerance of uncertainty, the null hypotheses was rejected at the .01 level of confidence. Table I contains the statistical data in support of this observation.

The three variables are interesting aspects of leadership when they are viewed from within the newly developing field of adult basic education. Especially important to any explanation of between-group variances shown in the data was the realization that guidelines for basic education leadership are either not fully known or tentative guidelines are used that do not differ substantially from those used in similar fields of educational leadership. Model techniques are only now in the beginning stages of development.

These observations may serve to explain variance in the area of demand

reconciliation and tolerance of uncertainty, both of which may relate to the emergence of basic education as a new field in the total pattern of adult education programs. In and of themselves, the variance observed on these two variables and on the variable, role assumption, does not imply future difficulty in the conduct of educational programs in the centers. Rather, the reverse is seen to be true. The fact that leaders in these programs administer in an arena of uncertainty, where conflicting demands are not easily resolved, or ever can be at this time, may be indicative of the embryonic stage of development of basic education.

It is evident by the data that the directors more fully realized the uncertainities of leadership than did their teachers. One might have expected this. On the other hand, teachers did not share the belief, as reflected in their opinions, of any uncertainness or demand reconciliation factors in their directors' leader behavior. To offer the conjecture that directors were very much concerned about such facets of administration as systemization, program development, and continuity in their school program is to reaffirm the proper stance of the administrator as the executor of the total program. While the administrator rated his behavior on a lower scale than the teachers, he was apparently not projecting his concern to his teachers, nor is he observed to be less organized in his direction of a school program than he himself believes.

The null hypotheses was rejected on a third variable, role assumption. Again, the difference in the opinions of the two groups, teachers and directors, was reflected in the higher rating by teachers of their leaders' behavior. The

teachers and directors did not share the same opinion about the active exercise of the leadership role. This should not be interpreted as an abrogation of leadership or even as evidence that directors exercise passive leadership.

On the contrary, both directors and teachers have scaled their opinions near the upper 20 per cent of the range. Leader behavior on the role assumption variable could be scaled further upward to show a maximum mean score of 50.00. In this study, the mean score on the role assumption variable for teachers' opinions was 41.01; for directors' opinions it was 36.64.

Why, then, should there be differences? Directors may be essentially in agreement with the remarks of one director, whose concern with meager appropriations for the basic education program was an obstacle to how much leadership he was able to exercise in his own center. Similar concerns could contribute to the directors' differences with their teachers in their opinions about leader behavior in this middle-management position, and as measured by this instrument. It must be recalled that in this study, the director was describing his own behavior while the teachers were describing his leader behavior as co-workers who serve in a subordinate relationship.

Another possible explanation is the interpretation of the item contained in the instrument. A relatively large number of school administrators employ a leadership technique that embraces the shared responsibility concept. The instrument used in this study reflects the one-man decision concept in its measurement of the variable, role assumption. The suggestion is, that while directors may actually be employing democratic practices in their administration

of the centers, teachers more positively observe role assumption in leader behavior than do their directors. Though this may be a specious argument, a non-sharing in the decision-making process would not seem to suggest a significant between-group variance in the opinions of the two groups of respondents. Experimental research that employs an instrument designed to measure the organizational climate would more likely offer substantive evidence in this interpretation of opinion on the role assumption variable.

Directly related to an interpretation of this aspect of leader behavior was the negative t value obtained on the variable, tolerance of freedom. While both mean scores for the two groups were relatively high, the directors believed they were more tolerant in their leader behavior than did the teachers. The negative t value would seem to suggest that the directors' beliefs about their own leader behavior on the role assumption and tolerance of freedom variables combines less active direction on their part and more encouragement of initiative and individual decision on the part of teachers. Would this seem to support the indictment of some observers that many administrators have encouraged more leadership from teachers than teachers are willing to assume?

II. Real and Ideal Behavior: Directors' Self-Descriptions

Table II reports the data obtained in computations of information on the directors' self-descriptions about their real and ideal leader behavior. It might have been expected that comparison of mean scores would show the ideal behavior of directors to be scaled higher than real leader behavior.

Significant differences at the .01 level of confidence appeared on the

variables demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of struction, role assumption, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, and integration. The null hypotheses that states, "No significant differences exist in the opinions of directors about how a director behaves and how he should behave", was rejected at the .01 level on these variables.

The negative t values computed for all but one aspect of leader behavior reflect the higher mean scores of directors' self-descriptions of behavior in the ideal. Except for the one aspect, tolerance of freedom, directors believed their real behavior does not truly reflect their leader behavior ideology, as a group, and as measured by this instrument. A conservative conjecture would be that directors are scaling themselves lower on real leader behavior than actual performance shown.

A comparison of Tables I and II reaffirmed the explanation that directors did scale themselves lower on real behavior when the comparison includes their teachers' ratings and also when an ideal leader behavior was juxtaposed with real behavior in self-descriptions. In this study, no attempt was made to measure differences between directors' and teachers' descriptions of ideal behavior. However, Tables II and III contain the mean scores of leader behavior as described by teachers and directors. If it is desired, comparison of mean scores can be made to compute variance through the use of the formula as shown on page 23. This study limited discussion to the three hypotheses.

Except for the positive t value on the tolerance of freedom variable, no particular overall pattern appeared as a result of the statistical computations.

TABLE II

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t RATIOS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN REAL AND IDEAL BEHAVIOR OF DIRECTORS' SELF-DESCRIPTIONS

	Real Leader Behavior of the Director			Ideal Leader Behavior of the Director				
Variable	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t	
Representation	20.09	3.477	11	22.00	1.414	11	-1.61	
Demand Reconciliation	18.36	2.541	11	23.09	1.758	11	-4.73	**
Tolerance of Uncertainty	34.00	6.557	11	41.55	4.390	11	-3.02	**
Initiation of Structure	36.55	5.466	11	45.36	3.982	11	-4.12	**
Persuasiveness	38.27	5.764	11	44.18	3.219	11	-2.83	**
Tolerance of Freedom	43.73	2.573	11	43.18	2.960	11	.444	
Role Assumption	36.64	5.714	11	44.00	3.578	11	-3.46	**
Consideration	40.91	2.663	11	44.00	4.171	11	-1.97	
Production Emphasis	30.45	4.612	11	36.64	4.567	11	-3.02	**
Predictive Accuracy	18.45	2.296	11	21.55	2.067	11	-3.17	**
Integration	20.09	2.256	11	23.18	1.834	11	-3.36	**
Superior Orientation	39.36	3.501	11	42.45	4.059	11	-1.82	

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence t (22) = 2.07

** Significant at the .01 level of confidence t (22) = 2.82

The fact that tolerance of freedom was scaled higher on real behavior of directors' self-descriptions attests to the belief by directors that, as a group, they tend to encourage teacher decision and initiative beyond their ideological models.

Admittedly, this sample was small, but the data did endorse the suggestion that the educational leadership in the centers, including the teachers, must train themselves for increased division of responsibility, encouragement of freedom and decision-making by teachers and the advisability of an examination of new interpretations of the leader's role in the basic education centers.

III. Real and Ideal Leader Behavior: Teachers' Descriptions

The highest expectations of leadership can be seen as teachers described their directors' real and ideal behavior. Statistical data are shown in Table III.

It will be recalled that two of the twelve variables tested for significance at the .05 level and one at the .01 level as real behavior was described by the teachers and the directors (see Table I). Mean scores in Table I for nine of the twelve variables were more nearly in agreement than mean scores made by teachers as shown in Table III.

Expectations by the teachers, reported as significant at the .01 level, included ten aspects of the directors' leader behavior. The null hypotheses that states, "No significant differences exist in the opinions of teachers about how a director does behave and how he should behave," was rejected on ten variables. The variables were representation, demand reconciliation,

persuasiveness, initiation of structure, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation.

Although significant differences were apparent on these variables, teachers, as a group, did endorse relatively high performance on real leader behavior as shown by the mean scores in Column 1 of Table III. Production emphasis was an exception; however, ideal behavior was also scaled lower on this aspect of behavior.

It was to be expected that the teaching staffs would offer higher standards in the leader behavior of their directors; but, the generalizability of these findings offered no criteria for judging effectiveness of leadership in the basic education centers. Care must also be taken in any effort to generalize the findings in terms of effectiveness of directors who are serving under an executive officer and who oftentimes reports to a middle echelon administrator who serves the school system in the broader specialization of adult education.

In this study, the importance of the information gleaned from the data was significant because it is the teachers, with their directors, who work cooperatively in the same closed environment of the school. It was the teachers who observed leader behavior from point-blank range and from the reference of their professional objective: to teach. No other group has a similar relationship where observation of overt behavior has more meaning for student success. Yet, traditional practice has placed the teacher several times removed from where executive decisions often take place.

TABLE III

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t RATIOS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN REAL AND IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR OF DIRECTORS: TEACHERS' DESCRIPTIONS

	Real Leader Behavior of the Director			Ideal Leader Behavior of the Director				
Variable	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t	
Representation	21.45	2.526	124	22.50	2.487	124	3.28	**
Demand Reconciliation	20.79	3.252	124	22.58	2.436	124	4.84	**
Tolerance of Uncertainty	39.26	5.655	124	40.61	5.305	124	1.93	
Persuasiveness	39.90	6.005	124	43.01	4.880	124	4.46	**
Initiation of Structure	40.38	5.049	124	42.00	4.075	124	2.77	**
Tolerance of Freedom	42.81	5.739	124	43.05	4.235	124	.373	
Role Assumption	41.01	5.908	124	44.06	5.368	124	4.24	**
Consideration	41.95	5.682	124	43.76	3.914	124	2.91	**
Production Emphasis	31.71	5.401	124	33.74	5.455	124	2.93	**
Predictive Accuracy	19.02	2.892	124	20.64	2.424	124	4.76	**
Integration	20.86	3.716	124	22.61	2.350	124	4.42	**
Superior Orientation	39.96	4.476	124	42.56	4.241	124	4.68	**

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence t (246) = 1.96
**Significant at the .01 level of confidence t (246) = 2.57

Expectations of the directors' leadership, as illustrated by the data in Table III, posit the need for a study of communications between all echelons of administration, an increased understanding of organizational structure, and broader inquiry into the processes of decision-making and responsibility criteria in school systems. It would appear that teacher expectations of their directors' leader behavior, while higher than their descriptions of real behavior, were attributable to a lack of teacher knowledge of the administrative process. Expectations by teachers exceeded their perceptions of real behavior, quite likely, because of a traditional reliance on a centralized organizational structure.

Perhaps Barnard's statement relates to the suggestion that incorporation of teacher understanding of the processes of administration include cooperative approaches to leadership:

> Cooperation, not leadership, is the creative process; but leadership is the indispensable fulminator of its forces.[14]

---

[14] Chester I. Barnard, The Function of the Executive, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 259.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Summary

In this study of the leader behavior of eleven directors of adult basic education centers, twelve variables of leadership were measured. The instrument used to measure acts of leadership of the director was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII. In two separate sessions, the opinions of the teaching staff, as well as the directors' self-opinions, were solicited on one hundred Likert-type items. A total of one hundred thirty-five respondents participated in eleven group interviews. Information gathered in these interviews consisted of descriptions of directors' leader behavior in the basic education centers. This information was requested on the basis of *how the director* does behave (real behavior) and how he should behave (ideal behavior).

Because there were two administrations of the same instrument for each respondent, a total of two hundred seventy completed questionnaires provided the raw data for subsequent statistical computation.

Three hypotheses in null form were tested for significance through an analysis of variance procedure. Each was rejected in part, as significant differences appeared on three or more variables of leader behavior. Means, standard deviations, and t values were obtained from the raw data; these were reported in table form.

On the variables demand reconciliation and role assumptions, significant

differences were found in all three hypotheses in this study. The tolerance of uncertainty variable tested for significance in two hypotheses. In the measurement of differences about how a director does behave and how he should behave from the teachers' point of view, significant differences appeared on ten of the twelve variables.

II. Conclusions

The two groups of respondents worked in a "closed environment" and therefore they have had ample opportunity to observe each others' behavior over varying lengths of time. The two groups have a superordinate-subordinate relationship in the basic education center and notwithstanding other factors influencing responses to measurement, the results of this study found both groups essentially in agreement about the directors' real behavior. Differences of opinion appeared as real behavior was juxtaposed with ideal behavior. Both the expectations of the director in describing his own behavior and the expectations of the teachers in describing their directors' behavior were scaled considerably higher than descriptions by both groups of respondents on real behavior.

Certain cautions in interpretation of the data were apparent to the investigator and these have been cited elsewhere in the research literature. This is especially true when an objective pencil-and-paper instrument is used. This study employed only the one objective instrument. Further evaluative research should guard against the limitations of halo, the necessity of respondents to have more direct access to information about leadership acts, and the

necessity to have a third group of respondents included in the study, perhaps the superintendent or the supervisor of the adult education program. Evaluation of the organizational climate, for example, could be correlated with the data obtained through such an instrument as the LBDQ. The ultimate direction of research in basic education administration would most profitably be in the area of evaluating leadership and the examination of casual relationships under certain conditions. This is a field research study and therefore its recommendations were restricted to the purposes for which the study was originally undertaken:

1. To focus attention on the newly developing field of adult basic education leadership.

2. To encourage further research in basic education, particularly, inquiry into leadership and leader behavior.

3. To posit the need for more scientific selection of our leaders in basic education.

4. To bring additional knowledge to the forefront for use of curriculum-makers in the preparation of leaders of basic education.

III. Recommendations

This field study has examined differences in the perceptions of the directors' leader behavior as it was observed (real) and as it should be (ideal). On the basis of the statistical procedures used in this study and in consideration of the findings, the recommendations were:

1. Teachers and directors were essentially in agreement on "what is" the leader behavior of directors in Illinois

basic education programs. The role of the administrator, basically understood by teachers and directors, should be reinforced through continued communication between, (a) members of the two groups, and (b) between the executive leadership of adult basic education and the two groups who serve students' needs directly.

2. Where disagreement existed between teachers and directors on "what is" the leader behavior of the director, there should be renewed efforts to reconcile both respondent groups' understanding of the directors' leadership acts. The variables, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, and role assumption are perceived as significantly different by the respondent groups in this study.

3. The data supported the conclusion that the expectations of teachers of their directors' ideal behavior falls short of the teachers'. Directors should re-examine their own goals toward continued improvement of their leader behavior.

4. Expectations of the directors' self-described leader behavior fell considerably short of their ideal. The data supported the conclusion that directors should *continue to hold an* ideology that is beyond self-satisfaction or complacence.

5. The high expectations of the leader behavior of the director by both groups showed some cause for an examination of the reasons why the "ideal" is not more closely associated with the real leader behavior of the director. Inquiry by the leadership in the central office into an understanding of their directors' higher expectations is recommended.

6. Further research of a more extensive nature should be initiated toward developing evaluative criteria for measuring leadership of basic education programs.

7. Background information received from both respondent groups suggested more comprehensive planning is needed in the preparation of teachers and directors of basic education. Informal information received in conversations with the respondents supported the need for specific

informal preparatory programs in the areas of adult psychology, teaching and directing remedial programs for adult, and personnel administration for recruitment and retention of students in remedial adult programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1963.

General Assembly of the State of Illinois, The Adult Education Act. 75th General Assembly, Senate Bill 1416, August 14, 1967.

Griffith, William S. "Public School Adult Education, A Growing Challenge," Administrators' Notebook, 13:1-4, March, 1965, p. 4.

Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959.

Kreitlow, Burton W. Educating the Adult Educator, Madison: University of Wisconsin, Department of Agriculture and Extension Education, March, 1965.

Schnert, Frank H. "A New Effort in Adult Education in Southern Illinois," Adult Leadership, 10:313-315, April, 1964, p. 314.

Stodgill, Ralph M. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1963.

United States Congress, Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1963, Title I. 89th Congress, H.R. 13161, November 3, 1966, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

APPENDIX A

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION CENTERS PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY

Doolittle Family Education Center
Chicago, Illinois

Hilliard Adult Education Center
Chicago, Illinois

Jackson Adult Education Center
Chicago, Illinois

Westinghouse Family Education Center
Chicago, Illinois

Danville Junior College Adult Basic Education Program
Danville, Illinois

Decatur Area Adult Continuation Center
Decatur, Illinois

East St. Louis Adult Education School
East St. Louis, Illinois

Eldorado Continuation Center for Adult Education
Eldorado, Illinois

Mattoon Area Educational Extension Center
Mattoon, Illinois

Peoria Adult Continuing Education Center
Peoria, Illinois

Rockford Division of Adult and Occupational Services
Rockford, Illinois

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE ITEMS FROM THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
Form XII

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undersirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group", as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members", refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

Directions:
a. READ each item carefully.
b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether he (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom, or (E) never acts as described by the item.
d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected. A=Always, B=Often, C=Occasionally, D=Seldom, E=Never.
e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: He often acts as described..... (A) B C D E
Example: He never acts as described ..... A B C D (E)
Example: He occasionally acts as described ..... A B (C) D E

1. He acts as the spokesman of the group ..... A B C D E
2. He allows the members complete freedom in their work..... A B C D E
3. He makes accurate decisions..... A B C D E
4. His arguments are convincing ..... A B C D E
5. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group..... A B C D E
6. He speaks as the representative of the group ..... A B C D E
7. He encourages initiative in the group members..... A B C D E
8. He seems able to predict what is coming next ..... A B C D E
9. He is a very persuasive talker..... A B C D E

10. He treats all group members as his equals ..... A B C D E
11. He represents the group at outside meetings..... A B C D E
12. He assigns a task, then lets the members handle it ..... A B C D E
13. Things usually turn out as he predicts ..... A B C D E
14. He is not a very convincing talker ..... A B C D E
15. He keeps to himself..... A B C D E
16. He gets swamped by details..... A B C D E
17. He is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action..... A B C D E
18. He sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated..... A B C D E
19. He is an inspiring talker..... A B C D E
20. He is willing to make changes..... A B C D E
21. He can reduce a madhouse to system and order ..... A B C D E
22. He trusts the members to exercise good judgment ..... A B C D E
23. He anticipates problems and plans for them ..... A B C D E
24. He can inspire enthusiasm for a project..... A B C D E
25. He acts without consulting the group ..... A B C D E

Copyright 1962, The Ohio State University

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEWER GUIDE

Name of center

Name of interviewer

Date of administration

Short orientation; outline purpose of study

Distribute first copy of Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

Explanation of background information sheet

Begin first administration of questionnaire

College completed copies of first administration

****

Distribute second copy of the questionnaire

Outline purpose of second administration (ideal behavior)

Begin second administration of questionnaire

Code first copy of questionnaire*

Collect completed copies of second administration

Extend thanks for participation; results to be sent upon completion of research

Code second copy of questionnaire*

*Explanation of code: first space - number of center
second space - 1 = teacher; 2 = director
third space - R = first administration
S = second administration

REMARKS:

APPENDIX D

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO DIRECTORS (SAMPLE)

Dear Mr._____:

I am writing to you at this time to more fully outline the design of the research mentioned in Mr. Keith Lape's letter of October eleventh. Mr. Lape has indicated a personal and professional interest in the study; further, he will be working with the downstate directors in the collection of data.

Because of the limited number of full-time ABE centers in Illinois, the success of the research depends heavily on a high per cent of participation. For this reason, I would like to confirm your interest in contributing staff time and involvement to the study. Though I would much prefer meeting with you to discuss the details beforehand, the distance factor is prohibitive. May I suggest that a telephone conversation would be fruitful toward explaining those details of the research that I could not possibly include in this letter.

For the present, let me attempt a capsule description of the design. The subjects would include the ABE director and the full-time teaching staff. It is important that immediate supervisors (directors or principals) and staff (full-time ABE teachers) be the only subjects. Full-time is here interpreted as a measure of time, 50 to 100 per cent of a school day, that a teacher expends instructing basic education students.

A questionnaire developed by Ohio State will be used in the collection of data. About 75 minutes are required for the session in each center. This instrument would be administered as a paper and pencil response to 200 items; all subjects would complete the questionnaire at the same time.

The results of the study will be tabulated collectively, that is, no attempt is being made to describe leader behavior, in this case, in any one center. The questionnaire is directed toward the leader behavior of the immediate supervisor, but it is not concerned with specific acts of leader behavior of leadership, per se.

Unless I have not fully investigated the research literature, this study will be the first of its kind in adult education; certainly it must be unique in adult basic education. An analysis of the results may tell us something about the training needs of ABE leaders, graduate curricula needs, or the several aspects of leader behavior in adult basic education in Illinois.

As noted in Mr. Lape's letter, a discussion of the research in manuscript form will be developed for use by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. From this manuscript, results of the research will be made generally available.

In the next few days following your receipt of this letter, I will contact you by telephone. At this time can we discuss the possibility of next steps?

I am very much looking forward to meeting you and the members of the staff at the_____Center.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX E

INFORMATION SHEET

The study in which you are participating is being conducted in all of the Adult Basic Education day centers in the State of Illinois. Approximately 300 teachers and principals are involved in the study.

We encourage your frankness in completing the questionnaire which follows. On your part, we can assure you - your individual descriptions will remain anonymous; our interest is in the collective results, only.

An abstract of the study will be made available to you upon completion of the research.

As a help to us in compilation of the data, please include the personal background information as follows:

1. Sex: ( ) M ( ) F

2. Present position:
   ( ) ABE teacher
   ( ) ABE principal

3. Highest degree held: Major
   ( ) No degree _____
   ( ) AB or BS _____
   ( ) Masters _____
   ( ) Masters + 30 _____
   ( ) Doctorate _____

4. Number of courses taken in Adult Education_____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

5. Experience in education:
   ( ) 1-3 years
   ( ) 4-6 years
   ( ) 7-9 years
   ( ) 10-12 years
   ( ) 13 years or more

6. Full-time experience in adult basic education only,_____years.

7. Grade level experience exclusive of adult basic education:
   ( ) None
   ( ) Elementary primary, K-3
   ( ) Intermediate, 4-6
   ( ) Elementary - junior high, 7-9
   ( ) Secondary, 10-12
   ( ) Junior college or College
   ( ) Adult education
   ( ) Special education

APPENDIX F

CODING SHEET*

1. Repres _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
2. Reconc _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
3. Tol Un _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
4. Persua _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
5. Struct _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
6. Tol Fre _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
7. Role As _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
8. Consid _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
9. Produc _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
10. Predict _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
11. Integration _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
12. Superior Orientation _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

*Item numbers have been omitted

Center Position _____
R or S _____

_____
Participant Number

TABLE IV

EXPERIENCE QUALIFICATIONS OF 128 TEACHERS IN THE BASIC EDUCATION CENTERS OF ILLINOIS

	Total Years of Experience in Education					One Year Minimum Experience in Adult Basic Education	Numbers of Teachers with Prior Grade Level Experience in Education							
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13+		None	G* K-3	G 4-6	G 7-9	G 10-12	Jr. Coll. or College	Spec. Educ.	Adult Educ.
**Cen. A	4	7	1	1	2	15	6	2	4	2	2	-	-	1
Cen. B	2	3	1	3	4	12	1	5	6	5	6	-	1	8
Cen. C	2	3	2	2	4	11	3	3	4	4	5	-	-	2
Cen. D	4	2	1	1	3	10	1	1	2	3	7	1	-	4
Cen. E	2	1	1	3	4	11	-	5	6	7	5	1	-	-
Cen. F	2	4	3	-	4	13	-	6	5	6	6	1	-	3
Cen. G	4	1	1	-	1	7	-	3	1	3	2	-	-	7
Cen. H	1	2	2	1	4	10	-	4	5	9	3	3	-	2
Cen. I	3	3	-	2	4	12	2	1	4	6	4	-	-	1
Cen. J	7	2	1	1	2	11	2	6	7	4	2	1	-	1
Cen. K	3	4	-	1	3	9	1	5	7	7	4	1	-	5
Totals	34	32	13	14	35	121	16	41	51	56	46	8	1	34

*Grades
**Center

TABLE V

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF 128 TEACHERS IN THE BASIC EDUCATION CENTERS OF ILLINOIS

	Sex		Highest Degrees Held					Number of Courses Taken in Adult Education			
	M	F	no Degree	1st Degree	2nd Degree	3rd Degree	4th Degree	1-2	3-4	5-6	over 6
Center A	7	8	9	5	1	-	-	-	8	2	-
Center B	3	10	-	11	2	-	-	4	-	-	1
Center C	2	11	-	12	1	-	-	8	-	-	-
Center D	2	9	1	5	3	2	-	3	-	-	-
Center E	3	8	1	2	5	3	-	3	-	-	-
Center F	2	11	3	9	1	-	-	4	-	-	-
Center G	3	4	3	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
Center H	5	5	-	6	3	1	-	4	1	-	-
Center I	8	4	2	7	1	2	-	3	2	2	-
Center J	7	5	-	9	3	-	1	8	-	-	-
Center K	6	5	2	7	-	2	-	2	2	1	1
Total	48	80	21	76	20	10	1	42	13	5	2

TABLE VI

EXPERIENCE QUALIFICATIONS OF 11 DIRECTORS OF BASIC EDUCATION CENTERS IN ILLINOIS

Total Years of Experience in Education					One Year Minimum Experience In Adult Basic Education	Directors' Prior Grade Level Experience in Education						
1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13+		None	Grades K-3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-9	Grades 10-12	Jr. Coll. or College	Adult Education
-	1	2	2	6	11	-	4	5	7	5	3	1

TABLE VII

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF 11 DIRECTORS OF
BASIC EDUCATION CENTERS IN ILLINOIS

Sex		Highest Degree Held				Number of Courses Taken in Adult Education			
M	F	1st Degree	2nd Degree	3rd Degree	4th Degree	1-2	3-4	5-6	Over 6
10	1	3	6	2	-	4	2	1	-

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 27 1969
on Adult Education